REMARKS

Specification Status

The Office Action cited several objections to the Specification. The Office Action states that Applicants did not make changes to all the trademarks on pages 15 and 18, and those that were made on pages 15 are still not proper. The Specification has been amended to reflect proper usage of a trademark in a specification as required by the Office Action.

The Office Action states that all the changes to the paragraphs of Claim 1 were not shown. The Office Action states "For example, in the first paragraph the original test after 'comprising' was not shown struck thru and the new fourth paragraph should be underlined in its entirety." Applicant respectfully points out that the terms "a topsheet; a backsheet; and" were inserted into the first line of Claim 1 between the term "comprising" and the term "an absorbent core" (see original Claims), and are underlined as required by the MPEP. The phrase "disposed between the topsheet and the backsheet" was inserted after the phrase "an absorbent core" and before the phrase "said absorbent core," and is underlined as required. As a result there appears to be no need to strike thru the text referred to in the Office Action. The phrase "and wherein said acquisition layer substrate has been treated with a high energy surface treatment" was added to the end of Claim 1, and is underlined as required. Since the remainder of the last paragraph was unmodified, there is no apparent reason to show any change.

Applicants believe that the amendments made to the Specification fully address the Office Action's objections. If, however, the Office still objects to the Specification with regard to showing the changes to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests that Office point out and clarify the specific reasons for such objection.

Claim Status

Claims 1 – 12 and 14 are pending in the present application. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

Claims 15 – 18 and 20 have been withdrawn as a result of the restriction requirement.

It is believed these changes do not involve any introduction of new matter. Consequently, entry of these changes is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

Response to Requirement for Restriction of Inventions

The Examiner has required, under 35 USC §121, election of a single disclosed invention for prosecution on the merits. Applicant hereby elects to prosecute the invention designated in the Office Action as Invention I. This election is made without traverse. Claims 1 – 12 and 14 are drawn to this invention.

Claims have been withdrawn by this amendment as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Conclusion

This amendment represents an earnest effort to place the application in proper form. Applicant respectfully requests that claims 1 – 12 and 14 be allowed. Early and favorable action in the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By

John Powell
Registration No. 57,927
(513) 634 – 2962

Date: September 14, 2006
Customer No. 27752
(Amendment-Response to Office Action.doc)
Revised 04/25/2006